

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

No. 6:24-cv-00303

James D. Williams,
Plaintiff,

v.

Ezenwanyi Onwuchekwa et al.,
Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff James D. Williams, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, filed this civil-rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to a magistrate judge, who issued a report and recommendation (Doc. 27) that plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 14) be denied as moot because plaintiff has been transferred from the Beto Unit. Plaintiff filed objections. Doc. 30.

Plaintiff contends that the medical staff at the Jester III Unit are retaliating against him because he filed a lawsuit against the Beto Unit medical staff and because the medical staff at both units have the same ethnic origin. Doc. 30. Plaintiff argues that a preliminary injunction should issue to prevent this retaliation.

The court reviews the objected-to portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation de novo. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The report correctly recommended denial of plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction because any request for injunctive relief at the Beto Unit became moot when plaintiff was transferred to the Jester III Unit. *See Herman v. Holiday*, 238 F.3d 660, 665 (5th Cir. 2001) (holding that inmate's transfer rendered his claim for declaratory and injunctive relief moot).

Furthermore, the Jester III Unit medical staff are not named as defendants in plaintiff's amended complaint, and his

retaliation claims against the Jester III Unit medical staff are also absent from the amended complaint. Doc. 5. His live complaint thus does not assert claims supporting injunctive relief against officials at the Jester III Unit. *See Bucklew v. St. Clair*, No. 3:18-cv-02117, 2019 WL 2251109, at *2 (N.D. Tex. May 15, 2019). Plaintiff's objections reflect a disagreement with the findings and conclusions of the report but fail to establish that any error in fact or law is present.

Having reviewed the magistrate judge's report, and being satisfied that it contains no error, the court accepts its findings and recommendation. Doc. 27. For the reasons stated in the report, plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 14) is denied.

So ordered by the court on June 26, 2025.



J. CAMPBELL BARKER
United States District Judge